UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,352	10/09/2001	Yandi Ongkojoyo		5264

7590 01/06/2005

DHARMAHUSADA PERMAI
XII / N - 405
SURABAYA, JAWA TIMUR, 60116
INDONESIA

EXAMINER	
DIVECHA, KAMAL B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/973,352	ONGKOJOYO, YANDI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KAMAL B. DIVECHA	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Peri d f r Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 October 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10/09/2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20011009*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The IDS filed on 10/09/2001 has been considered.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claimed features 1-7 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Sp cification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "the net" is unclear to the examiner.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As per claim 1, the disclosure fails to provide any meaningful hardware/software components necessary to implement the virtual reality environment where a user can use "any operating system" to display the virtual environment (note: M. S. D.O.S 3.0 version is an operating system).

As per claim 2, the claimed subject matter of building web sites with virtual reality environment is not disclosed or described in the specification. Disclosure fails to teach how the web sites would have been generated or built.

Further, the disclosed limitations in the body of the claim 2 do not support the preamble of claim 2.

As per claim 3, the disclosure fails to show the input and output means as claimed subject matter.

Claim 4 is rejected due to its dependency on claim 1.

As per claim 5-7, the disclosure fails to teach and show the user verification means and means for allowing multiple users to interact.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- Claim 1 recites the limitation "the web" in the preamble. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claim 4 recites the limitation "the system" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claim 5 recites the limitation "said program" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- Claim 6 recites the limitation "said program" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

- Claim 7 recites the limitation "said program" and "said user" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

As per claims 3 and 5-7, they contain brackets, and words within those brackets, are in improper form. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based upon the invention anticipated by Matsuda et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,268,872 B1).

Matsuda et al discloses:

As per claim 1, A method for displaying a virtual reality environment on the web comprising the steps of: (a) downloading virtual reality web application (read as script program and VRML file) (fig. 5 item #2 and #10b); (b) downloading virtual environment data (read as VRML contents) (fig. 5 item #2 and #10b); (c) displaying virtual reality environment using a browser; whereby user can use any operating system to display the virtual environment (fig. 17, 18 and 19; fig. 3 item #1; col. 5 L60-67).

As per claim 4, a computer program product having a computer readable medium having computer program logic recorded thereon, as a part of the system of claim 1, comprising means for displaying virtual reality environment (col. 5 L60-67); means for building virtual reality web

sites or virtual environment (col. 6 L24-65); and means for delivering the virtual environment via Internet (col. 5 L18-23).

As per claim 6, the computer program of claim 4 wherein said program further comprises means (an interaction system) for allowing multiple users to interact each other (fig. 18, multi-user window)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Matsuda et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,268,872 B1) in view of Tokiwa (U. S. Pub No. 2002/0010635 A1).

As per claim 5, Matsuda et al., does not explicitly disclose the process of conversation-like password verification system for user verification.

Tokiwa explicitly discloses the process of password verification process (pg. 1, para. 0019; pg. 3 para. 0049).

At the time invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to incorporate the process of Tokiwa as stated above with the system and method of Matsuda in order to provide user verification.

The motivation for doing so would have been so that a secure communication would have taken place blocking unauthorized users from accessing the information and preventing personal information from leaking (Tokiwa, pg. 5, para. 67; pg. 1, para. 7-15).

12. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Matsuda et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,268,872 B1) in view of Shiloh (U. S. Pub No. 2001/0037316 A1).

As per claim 7, Matsuda does not explicitly disclose the means (an interaction system) for allowing a user to assign a virtual entity to represent said user.

Shiloh et al explicitly discloses the process of assigning a virtual entity to real users for Internet activity (pg. 6 para. 47; pg. 2 para 18, 19 and 20).

At the time invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to incorporate the teaching of Shiloh as stated above with the system and method of Matsuda for the purpose of interacting with a communication networks.

The motivation for doing so would have been to enhance user activity on a large communication network for effective interaction on the Internet, the real users would have remained anonymous while interacting freely on the Internet and engaging in activities such as surfing, e-mailing, shopping and chatting. This would have also provided the ability to interact with the Internet privately and efficiently (Shiloh, pg. 2 para. 18).

13. Claims 2 and 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Matsuda et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,268,872 B1) in view of Tokiwa (U. S. Pub No. 2002/0010635 A1) and further in view of Goden (U. S. Patent No. 6,426,752 B1).

As per claim 2, Matsuda discloses the process of building a general web site with virtual reality environment (col. 6 L24-39; fig. 12), however, Matsuda does not explicitly disclose the process of building e-commerce web sites and online-game web sites.

Tokiwa, from the same field of endeavor, explicitly discloses building and providing e-commerce web site with virtual reality environment (fig. 3; pg. 1 para. 18 and 26), however, Tokiwa does not explicitly disclose the process of building online-game web site.

Goden, from the same field of endeavor, explicitly discloses the game device that permits generation of images of objects moving through a virtual space (see abstract; fig. 2; col. 4 L28-38).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to incorporate the teaching of Tokiwa and Goden as stated above in order to obtain a system for building e-commerce and online-game web sites.

The motivation for doing so would have been beacuse browsing the web with virtual environment would have enabled may different activities such as online research, surfing, playing games, downloading and uploading files, experiencing multimedia presentations, online chats and instant messaging, and engaging in electronic commerce.

As per claim 3, Matsuda discloses first means (input devices) for acquiring input from users (fig. 4 item #42 and #41); and second means (output devices) for displaying information (fig. 4 item #45).

Additional References

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

a. Matsui et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,956,028.

b. Satoh et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,675,197 B1.

c. Matsuda et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,926,179.

d. Ibarra et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,539,406 B1.

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is 571-272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on 9.00am-5.30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER